

SNSF Starting Grants Call 2023: Evaluation form for panel members and reviewers

1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All panel members as well as all peer-reviewers (only for applications selected for phase 2) are asked the same questions, following the evaluation criteria in section 5.3 of the [Call document for SNSF Starting Grants 2023](#).

2 Evaluation form

Questions on "Scientific quality of the research project"

Q1: Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research project

- To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?
- To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g., novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines)?
- To what extent is the proposed research high-risk/high-gain (i.e. if successful the payoffs will be very significant, but there is a high risk that the research project does not entirely fulfil its aims)?

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; border-bottom: 1px solid #ccc; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> </div> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; border-bottom: 1px solid #ccc; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> </div> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; border-bottom: 1px solid #ccc; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> </div> <div style="height: 150px;"></div> </div>

Figure 1: Screenshot of comment fields.

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

Rating *	
<input type="radio"/>	9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	8
<input type="radio"/>	7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	6
<input type="radio"/>	5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	4
<input type="radio"/>	3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	2
<input type="radio"/>	1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Figure 2: Screenshot of SNSF rating scale.

Q2: Scientific approach

- To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high-risk/high-gain?
- To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?

- To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodology?
- To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources and PI commitment adequate and properly justified?

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Question on "Qualification of the applicant"

Q: Intellectual capacity and creativity of the applicant

- To what extent has the applicant demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?
- To what extent does the applicant provide evidence of creative independent thinking?
- To what extent does the applicant have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Question on "Overall assessment"

Please provide a rating on the following scale for your overall assessment of the proposal, considering the strengths and weaknesses in the criteria-based assessment. Use 5 as the entry point from which to develop your arguments to grade lower or higher.


Rating *	
<input type="radio"/>	9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	8
<input type="radio"/>	7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	6
<input type="radio"/>	5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	4
<input type="radio"/>	3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	2
<input type="radio"/>	1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Please summarise the main reasons for your overall assessment by listing the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the proposal.

This statement is the most important part of your recommendation, as it makes the reasoning behind your assessment transparent, it prepares the panel for the decision-making, and it provides the administrative office with the necessary information for the further processing of the proposal. A summary of your statement will be forwarded to the applicant, especially in the case of negative funding decisions.

Main reasons for your overall assessment *

(8000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor toolbar with icons for Bold (B), Italic (I), Underline (U), Bulleted List, Numbered List, Undo, Redo, Cut, Copy, Paste, Print, Spell Check, Font Color, and Background Color.